

## THE BLONDE BEAST, THE MAN WITH THE HOE AND PHILOSOPHY OF DESPAIR

The Idealism of Brute Force and the Doctrine of Non-Resistance to Evil Compared and Analyzed

BY ISADOR LADOFF

Rationalistic modern Socialism is based not on certain economic theories and maxims, as some narrow-minded "Socialists pure and simple" think and fain would make others believe, but on the broad foundation of modern science and thought. The economic theories peculiar to modern Socialism are not all there is in it, but they are rather the application of the results of the achievements of modern knowledge and philosophy to the field of social economics. The trouble with the "Socialists pure and simple" is in the extreme limitations of their mental horizon. They happen to know, or rather imagine that they have mastered Marxian economics, while modern science and philosophy remains for them a sealed letter. That is why they get irritated whenever and wherever they meet in the socialistic press an article containing something else than the everlasting parrot-like repetitions of pseudo socialistic commonplaces and shibboleths. Every attempt to present to the attention of the readers of socialistic publications glimpses of the radiant world of science and philosophy, leading up to socialistic ideas and ideals in all their world redeeming significance, appears to the simple-minded and suspicious, simon-pure socialists, as an attack on somebody or something, as a heresy and heterodoxy of some kind. To such people the religion of science is the religion of ignorance and vice versa—ignorance is their religion and science.

But what have these remarks to do with the theme of this article, with the blonde beast, the man with the hoe and the philosophy of despair? Nothing; except that they are apt to show the utter helplessness of the simon-pure socialist when confronted with problems of deeper and broader significance than "surplus value" and iron laws of "supply and demand," problems without the solution of which an actual knowledge even of these economic theories is impossible. A simon-pure socialist is dead sure that he is in possession of the truth, of the whole truth and nothing but the truth, that all who do not exactly agree with him in his dogmatic faith are either fools or knaves, or both at the same time. He is happy in his belief. Ask him, however, what and why he thinks one way or another about the philosophy of Nietzsche or Tolstoy and you will hear him call them names instead of bringing forth arguments, tending to show the same materialistic conception of history he pretends to represent in the capacity of an orthodox Marxist.

We will in this article not mention again the orthodox Marxists, fearing that we be accused of attacking them, which is not our intention; we limit ourselves to the consideration of the two great German and Russian individualistic or anarchistic thinkers from the socialistic point of view. Nietzsche, philosopher of an epoch of blood and iron in German history, and Tolstoy, the representative of the thought of the Russian era of Czarism, are unlike each other as are the respective races, cultures and civilizations they belong to. Two things are, however, common to both of them. The philosophy of Nietzsche—the idealizer of brute force—leads to the same blind alley of despair in the future fate of humanity, to utter pessimism, as the philosophy of Tolstoy—the preacher of non-resistance to evil. Both Nietzsche and Tolstoy declare for the supremacy of the individual over the race and despise social institutions as tending to the deterioration of the individual; both are anti-socialistic or anarchistic in their trend of thought. That some anarchists, as, for instance, Victor Yarros, do not see in Nietzsche one of their apostles, a man who dared to reduce the anarchistic philosophy to its utmost logical conclusions, the apotheosis of the brute force in man, of the blonde beast, goes only to show that there are so-called philosophical anarchists just as narrow and simple-minded as some of our friends, the socialists pure and simple.

The historical conditions created the landed gentry or junker caste in Germany, an arrogant, ignorant and brutal class of a semi-feudal and semi-capitalistic stamp. This class represents the type of physical health and perfection of the Caucasian branch of the animal styled by learned men homo sapiens, or, in plain English, the blonde beast. The blonde beast is endowed by nature with gigantic appetite and absence of any moral restraint; it is ready and willing to devour

all and everything in sight and out of sight. It glories in its physical force and has no conception whatever of the spiritual, mental or moral part of human nature except as a means to its chief and only aim—the satisfaction of its desires, to rule and enjoy life in spite of all and everything antagonistic to it. All those who do not happen to belong to the Junker class are not aristocratic over-men, or blonde beasts, but common under-men (or rather under dogs), a lower race, that has to feel happy and dignified by subordination to a higher one. The German Junker as over-man and blonde beast is the first born, the beloved son of God and Nature, the fittest to survive. All other mortals have to obey when the blonde beast gives orders. The common under-men have to slave all their lives in order to allow the over-man to enjoy life and multiply.

This is the law of God and Nature, according to the philosophy of Nietzsche, with one slight modification. The philosopher of the blonde beast broke the caste lines and substituted the purely individual qualifications of a blonde beast for the accident of birth. He was liberal enough to admit that there are blonde beasts outside of the Junker caste and that some Junkers may accidentally be under-men.

But enough of that nude brute Junker anarchism of war and strife. Let us turn to the more sympathetic, although just as pathologic, anarchism of peace and passive submission to evil—the philosophy of Count Leo Tolstoy. If the triumphant but stupid blonde beast arouses our just indignation and hatred, the Russian mushik, the genuine man with the hoe, deserves our pity and compassion, our sympathy and moral support. Count Leo Tolstoy is the philosopher of the Russian man with the hoe, just in the same sense as Nietzsche of the German Junker. It does not require much mental exertion to understand the philosophy of blonde beast, its origin and psychology. But it is quite a task to unravel the mystery of the soul-life of the man with the hoe. We westerners are all more or less blonde beasts in our daily life, but we have no key in our mind to the condition of mind of the Russian mushik, who is so far from us in every respect. Imagine a human being born and reared in a primitive rural community in entire dependence of the uncertainties of nature and whims and fancies of an awkward, antediluvian, cruel and wasteful police-state and state-church. Nature and social economic conditions both work in the direction of creating deep dissatisfaction and the recognition of the uselessness of all individual efforts to find the source of the evil, its causes and remedies against it. The Russian peasant, on account of his dense ignorance, is not able to correct the irregularities of nature by artificial irrigation and fertilization of the soil. He is brought up in deep, slavish reverence for all authority—state and church. He silently, like a Roman gladiator, dies of starvation and submits without grumbling to all the extortion in blood and money by the Czar's government.

The man with the hoe is not a beast, but a poor, suffering, thinking human being. He cannot fail to see that there is evil, and much of it, in the world. The powers confronting him are the state and its handmaid—the church. Is it not natural that the Russian jumps at the conclusion that the state is intrinsically, essentially an evil, the work of the anti-Christ? The conclusion that the church is an evil is, however, modified by the intense religious instincts of the Slavic race. The Russian peasant can create for himself and as a matter of fact does create for himself another, better religion, than that presented by the official state church in the shape of numerous semi-rationalistic sects. He, however, does not know of any government but that of the Czar. Hence his religious, unconscious anarchism. Ages of submission and enslavement to the dominant classes on one side and a healthy idealism and touching childish faith in the ultimate victory of light and truth over darkness and falsehood inherent in the soul of the man with the hoe, are the sources of the obviously absurd maxim of non-resistance to evil. The Russian mushik is a truthseeker by nature and inclination, but he gropes in the dense darkness of ignorance and superstition.

Count Leo Tolstoy is only the spokesman

man of the plain Russian peasant. He does not believe in science, because it has not so far benefited the man with the hoe; he denies art for the same reason; he fights the institutional church, but finds himself in accord with the original teachings of the religion of the man-with-the-hoe—of Jesus of Nazareth; he denies all kinds of government, because it is the very personification of evil in his native land and far from perfection in other countries. The immense physical power in the command of the Russian ruling classes in the shape of a blindly-obedient, excellently-drilled army, crushing all opposition at its very inception, is the explanation of his non-resistance to evil. The blonde beast philosophy of Nietzsche leaves no hope for the under-man, the plain people. The man-with-the-hoe philosophy of Tolstoy preaches submission to the blonde beast. There is perfect harmony between Nietzsche and Tolstoy, in spite of the immense distance dividing them as men and thinkers. Social Democracy will fight and vanquish the blonde beast, but what shall be done with the man with the hoe?

### Boomerangs

You pray for the poor, but you vote for the rich.

You favor the brotherhood of man, but you want to be the big brother.

You object to Socialism because it prevents a man from working for whomsoever he pleases, so you make him work for whoever pleases to engage him.

You fear men will have no incentive under Socialism, so you vote in favor of threatening them with starvation if they fail to get a job now.

You want to know who will do the dirty work under Socialism, but you are quite willing that it be left to the poor (and the politicians) under the present system.

You wonder what we would do with the man who wouldn't work under Socialism, but you are not very much worried about the man we won't let work under the present system.—Southern Socialist.

### May Day in Europe

May day passed quietly in Paris, and the departments, with the exception of Grenoble, where scuffles occurred at the close of a meeting. The gendarmes charged the crowds and some policemen were injured.

Several demonstrations occurred in Spanish cities, but there were no serious disturbances. At Barcelona a group of strikers pillaged the chapel of a convent and were dispersed by the troops.

Some disturbances are reported from parts of Portugal, and an imposing demonstration was made in Lisbon.

Both in Rome and in the Italian provinces May day was passed quietly, and orderly meetings were held.

Ten thousand persons took part in an orderly May day procession at Vienna. The publication of newspapers was suspended for thirty hours. Meetings were held at Vienna and in the provinces.

### Outlook for Socialism in England

But now is there any hope of the English workers at all? Will they show up any better in the first half of the twentieth century than they did in the last half of the nineteenth? It is very difficult to say. I may say at once that unless we experience some serious shock from without I cannot take a favorable view of the situation here from the Socialist standpoint. There is no enthusiasm among the mass of the English people for anything. They vote persistently for their masters, not because they love them but because they really don't know any better and won't take the trouble to learn. A football match or a sale between horses they have never seen and never will see has much more interest for them, a direct, betting, pecuniary interest, than their own well-being, or that of their wives and children. Ignorant, conceited and too often degraded and embittered by their wretched surroundings, the English working classes are not nice people to work for. No, unless we have a shock from without we shall not make the progress here that our stage of economic growth might lead us to hope for. Two factors are needed in order to achieve Socialism on the stage immediately preceding the co-operative commonwealth—the economic development and the educated consciousness of such development. In the first we are not far behind America; in the second we are far behind Germany.—H. M. Hyndman, in Challenge.

The invasion of Kentucky by a small army of union miners of southern Indiana, well armed, to compel the union miners to lay down their tools or join the union and strike for higher wages was a novel exhibition of zeal. It is quite probable that these Indiana coal miners voted the Mark Hanna ticket last November because they were promised prosperity. Experience is a dear school, but there are some unfortunate with wheels in their heads who are not benefited by its teachings.

## A NOTABLE LABOR DISPUTE IN ENGLAND

General Federation of Trade Unions is Occupied with an Investigation of the Penrhyn Quarry Case—Pete Curran on the Committee

BY JOHN PENNY, Secretary I. L. P.

A considerable portion of the report of the General Federation of Trade Unions is occupied with an investigation into and commentary upon the Penrhyn dispute, which has figured in the public mind so prominently during the last six months. The Federation Executive sent a deputation to Bethesda, consisting of Mr. Pete Curran, chairman, and Mr. Isaac Mitchell, secretary, to inquire into the matter and if possible arrive at an amicable settlement. The deputation endeavored to obtain interviews with Lord Penrhyn and Mr. Young, the owner and manager of the quarry respectively, but those gentlemen declined to appoint a meeting. Consequently the deputation was compelled to spend its time among the men and such other people as it believed could assist the inquiry. If, however, the report is somewhat one-sided, Lord Penrhyn and Mr. Young have themselves to thank for it. "The grievances of the men," says the deputation, "may be summed up as follows:

1st. The union is not recognized.

2d. The management, while partially recognizing collective action, do all in their power to discourage it, even, the men allege, to the extent of discharging those who go upon deputations.

3d. They desire the reinstatement of certain victimized men.

4th. The men are prevented holding meetings in any part of the quarry, and from collecting subscriptions. This will be better understood when it is pointed out that the men's homes are scattered over a very large area, and it is difficult for them to meet at any other place or time, also that they all carry their food, it being impossible for them to get out of the quarry, owing to its size, to get dinner; they have, therefore, a considerable length of time to spare during this hour.

5th. Minimum wage is not recognized. The nature of the rock varies largely, so much so, in fact, that on bad rock poundage is allowed to make up their wage; the granting of poundage is in the hands of the "letters." In letting the work, or as it is termed, making bargains, they try to fix the price so that the men may earn 27s. 6d. per week; the men desire a minimum of 4s. 4d. per day. The management reply that this would mean their having to discharge over 200 old men who could not earn that amount.

6th. The men desire the abolition of the contract system, but are willing to take contracts co-operatively.

7th. They object to the bullying of the contractors and subordinate officials.

8th. The rules of discipline are harsh, the most serious probably being the fines, by which the men who may be fifteen minutes or less late lose a half day's pay, over fifteen minutes a whole day; the fines go to the sick club.

9th. They desire more democratic management of the benefit club.

10th. Permission to have an annual holiday.

These grievances were submitted to Mr. Young at a conference held between him and four representatives of the men on December 19, 1900. The result of that conference was that Mr. Young would make no alterations in respect to Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. In respect to No. 3, he agreed to try the co-operative system as an experiment, but it must be in a part of the quarry where no contract had previously existed, existing contracts to remain as at present. The men objected to this as an extension of the contract system. No. 7. Mr. Young promised to deal with well authenticated cases which might be brought before him. No. 8. We believe that the fines prior to the stoppage were, for fifteen minutes or less late, the loss of one day's pay; this was reduced at the conference by one-half. No. 9. Mr. Young promised to place the benefit club under more democratic management. No. 10. It was mutually agreed to leave this over for further consideration.

Since the vote was taken on these proposals, which the men rejected by 1,707 votes to 77, Mr. Young has issued a circular to a number of the men and offered, if they return to work, that the fines for being late, etc., will be altered to suspension, the suspensions to be from one-quarter day upwards.

With regard to the position of the men, we have a favorable report to submit. The total number employed at the quarry prior to the stoppage was 2,650; of these 280 (principally old men) were left at work, of the remainder 1,750 were union men, 470 non-union men; while about 150 were sick. Of the 1,750 union men only 560 were financial members, the others having joined since last year.

The explanation of the large increase since that time is that in May Mr. Young posted a notice that no more money was to be collected in the quarry, except for charitable purposes. (The men allege that this was done with the hope that it would for ever break up the union.) Up to that time the union officials had been allowed to collect the contributions in the dinner hours; the men's names being arranged in the contribution books according to the gallery in which they were employed in the quarry. The posting of this notice necessitated an entire alteration in their method of collecting, and also in their method of keeping their books. Collectors had to be appointed for each hamlet and district surrounding Bethesda, the result being that by the new method the union increased threefold, showing very clearly the fear in which the men held the management.

We found that only financial members were receiving union and Federation support; not one of those who had less than twelve months' membership was supported by the union.

Speaking generally on the position, we should say that unless something is done to bring the two parties together the dispute will last until the men are literally starved into submission."

After the presentation of this report the Federation again asked Mr. Young to meet a deputation so that any misconceptions in the minds of the men might be dispelled, but he again categorically refused, as "it was a rule that discussion on business affecting the relations between employed and employer should be conducted by the parties concerned."

It is fair to deduce then that the position in the quarry is as follows:

(a) The management will only deal with the employees direct. No outside intervention will be allowed.

(b) The management pretenses to allow the men to belong to a trade union, but steadily tries to crush the union out of existence.

(c) Therefore, it appears to be the aim of the management to have direct dealings with the men as individuals.

Perhaps it will appear to some that the first clause is perfectly fair, but there are several ways of looking at it. When one considers the position of the working man as opposed to the work's manager it is evident he is at a serious disadvantage. Mr. Young, for example, is probably a well-educated man, he has plenty of legal opinion behind him, and he has had years of training in business methods. The humble and innocent quarryman, however, has probably read little, and has absolutely no business knowledge. He knows he wants better wages or shorter hours or a grievance removed, but when he comes to face the manager, a master of bluff and finesse, he is simply turned inside out. Hence through his trade union he engages an expert who can meet the manager on fairly equal ground and state his case for him. Lord Penrhyn and Mr. Young will not meet the expert. They naturally prefer to deal with the quarryman himself.

Another point to be borne in mind is that trade unionists always aim at having paid officials. They want men who will not be afraid of victimization. If I understand aright this is what has happened at Bethesda. They have taken a man from the quarry, and made him quite independent of Mr. Young so that he can meet that gentleman on equal terms without the fear of being deprived of his means of livelihood. To the outsider this seems like a perfectly reasonable idea, but Mr. Young declares he will not meet such an official or officials. He prefers direct dealing with men who have to depend upon him for the privilege of working at their trade.

As to the unwisdom of the attitude of Lord Penrhyn and Mr. Young there can be no doubt. Experience has proved all over the country that trade union officials prefer peace to war. Where friendly relations are maintained between employers and officials grievances can be talked over and adjusted without friction. In many a workshop and factory to-day everything goes like clockwork because the manager is willing to meet the union secretary and discuss differences.

With regard to clause c, it will be evident that when it comes to bargaining made between individuals, the working man has very little chance against the millionaire. Lord Penrhyn has said: "The quarries are mine and I intend to do with them as I like." The quarrymen by combination have, however, prevented them being worked these many

(Continued on Fourth Page)



## Social Democratic Weekly

Published by the  
SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF AMERICA

Executive Board  
General Secretary, Chicago  
Editor, Chicago  
Business Manager, Chicago  
C. A. Clement, Chicago  
F. A. Lyndner, Chicago  
J. L. Miller, New York  
J. L. Miller, New York  
J. L. Miller, New York

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—One year, \$5.00. Six months, \$3.00. No papers sent to any one on credit. If, without having subscribed, you receive it, then it has been subscribed for by a friend and no bill will follow. Foreign subscriptions \$10.00.

Published at Chicago postoffice as second class matter.

A. S. EDWARDS, Editor  
THEODORE DEHN, National Secretary-Treasurer  
126 Washington St., Chicago.

149 is the number of this paper. If the number on your wrapper is 149 your subscription has expired with the next week's paper. Please renew promptly.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 11, 1901.

## Social Democratic Party Vote 1900 (PRESIDENTIAL) 97,024

A writer remarks, "We are living in the end of an age." Which end, please?

Old Li Hung Chang thinks there are too many Christian bulls in the emperor's China shop.

The labor unions of Ohio, those reporting, paid out last year \$69,350 for benefits to their members and had on hand for the same purpose \$130,695.

The guns of the armies of Socialism are ideas. The enemy can't spike them, and the more of them it captures the better it is for Socialism and humanity.

McKinley's army in the Philippine islands is a steel trust having the protection of "old glory," and operates directly under the muzzles of our imperial guns.

"The history of all society," says a writer, "thus far is the history of class strife." And it should be added that in this strife the poor never gained a victory.

It may be said that under our civilization more opportunities are offered for the poor to become poorer and the rich richer than at any previous period in the world's history.

Workingmen, receiving one-fourth of what they earn, often less, and cheated out of a portion of that, have always had a struggle for existence. Socialism proposes a change of program.

A president and cashier looted a bank at Vancouver, Wash., and then blew the tops of their heads off. The mistake they made was in not killing themselves before they stole the money.

Physicians occasionally administer deadly poisons in fighting certain obdurate diseases, and perhaps a little of the devil in prescriptions for remedying the curse of capitalism would be in order.

Voltaire, says Victor Hugo, declared war against conditions of all social inequities and fought them with his pen, "a weapon which has the lightness of the wind and the power of the thunderbolt."

"War is hell," said General Sherman. Public opinion in the United States favors McKinley's war in the Philippine islands, hence public opinion is in favor of hell; and the same is true of the devil.

It is said that the man who makes two blades of grass grow where only one had previously grown is a philanthropist, but in a larger sense is a man the benefactor of mankind who adds to the number of the Socialist army.

It is stated on good authority that in the city of Boston aldermen can be bought at from \$5 to \$10 each. Capitalism has an easy job in Boston, and may call the roll of its slaves under the shadow of Bunker Hill monument.

Emperor William of Germany, should the anarchists succeed in taking his scalp, will die with the proud reflection that he has provided heads enough to conduct the business at the old stand with ample ability to draw their salary.

When a workingman asks for a job what it ever known that the plutocrat inquired how many children he had to support, that he might add something to the daily wage to make the kids happy? The ages do not record such an incident.

A tenderfoot complains because of too much noise in great cities, and suggests a public uprising to silence noise. The probabilities are that a great deal more noise will be heard in all of our great cities if conditions do not change for the better.

New Jersey has suddenly become conspicuous as a nest where anarchists plot murder. The state has long since been the den for breeding trusts, and as between trusts and anarchists the distance

is but a step and the difference immaterial, though a trust disarming workingmen and setting their drift has caused more sorrow than all the anarchists in Christendom.

A Patagonian chief recently offered a captain of a British ship the land over which he ruled for a quart of rum. The price seems cheap, but it is more than McKinley paid for Porto Rico.

The latest thing in the way of inventions is the paper coffin. The inventor claims that the introduction of paper coffins will reduce the cost of funerals and thereby add to the comforts of the living.

The carpenters of Indianapolis struck for 35 cents an hour and an eight-hour day. They compromised on 32½ cents an hour without reference to hours of work, a gain of 2½ cents an hour or about \$1.30 a week.

A masculine member of New York's "400" has sued another of his class for alienating the affections of his wife, claiming damages to the amount of \$150,000, equal to 750 shares of stock in the Standard Oil trust.

The latest suggestion is to raise \$100,000 to build a monument to the late ex-president, General Benjamin Harrison. Why not make it \$111,000? That would be \$1,000 for each man of the military company he commanded to shoot down railroad employes in the strike of 1877.

It is said "no man makes a revolution and no man can check a revolution." In response to such propositions yes or no are equally authoritative. In the Central and South American states one man has been known to make a revolution in an hour, while another man has checked it by killing the maker.

Never was a government more ruthlessly administered by a class and for a class than the government of the United States. Capitalism dominates in everything. It supplied the money which enabled Mark Hanna to elect McKinley, and permits neither congress nor courts to act independent of its will.

Tennessee, grasping the Socialistic idea, has a law, recently enacted, prohibiting child labor. Under the sway of Socialism children and women will not be required to drudge in factories. The home will be their empire, and instead of being dark and cheerless it will be the center of love and light and happiness.

It is the idea of some people that error, wrong, injustice, must be accorded a period of time more or less extended in which to take root, grow, hnd, blossom and bear fruit before it is in order to exterminate them. But the truth is they have no more right to live than a poisonous plant, a cobra or a tiger, and it is always in order to kill them.

Said a captain of industry, "See that machine? It cost me \$10,000, and will do the work of twenty men. I pay a man \$400 a year to attend it. I estimate the annual expense of the machine for interest on the investment and wear and tear at 6 per cent, or \$600 a year. Twenty men at \$400 a year is \$8,000. Deduct interest and the cost of overseeing, \$1,000, and my profit on the machine is \$7,000 a year." Under co-operation advocated by Socialism the profits of the machine would go to the workers.

If "Socialism is a mere dream—nothing more," how much better as a dream than the wild and horrible reality of competition! How much better than Jeffersonian democracy, which is a mere memory—nothing more. Socialism is an anticipation; Jeffersonian democracy is a recollection. Socialism owns the future; Jeffersonian democracy is owned by the past. Socialism is a moving, potent, universal force; Jeffersonian democracy is an inscription on a tombstone.

At a Fourth of July celebration in Boston in 1833 the following toast to "lovely woman" was proposed: "Woman:—When we affect to consider her inferior to man, let us not forget that she first discovered the tree of knowledge and first dared to eat the forbidden fruit; while Adam had not pluck enough to pluck an apple, nor capacity enough to swallow one, for it stuck in his throat."

In these later days we men can reflect over the fact that it was the women who found a way to get at the non-taxpaying corporations of Illinois. "We ain't so much," after all.

Capitalism affirms that trusts, by the consolidation of industrial plants under one management whereby expenses are reduced, is simply the result of evolution in the science of economics, and that if in the process men are thrown out of employment it results from the fact that in the evolution of machinery there are more men than are required to do the work required. Capitalism, the captains of industry affirm, is not eleemosynary in its nature or operations. It is simply organized greed, obeying the letter of the law everywhere governing individuals and nations. In this connection it is pointed out that organized labor is more heartless than the trusts. When a trust

forces a man into idleness it is because his services are no longer wanted—there is nothing for him to do—while organized labor forces a man into idleness simply because he is a non-union workman, a penalty imposed upon independence, without which men cease to be men.

Tolstoi, the Russian agitator, the excommunicated Christian, the Abbot Ben Adhem of the east's empire, discussing conditions, says that "fortunes are acquired always either by violence—the most common way—or by avarice, or by some huge villainy, or by chronic swindling, as in the case of trade. The better a man is the more sure he is of losing his wealth, and the worse a man the more sure he is of retaining and increasing his fortune. The laws which claim to protect property are laws protecting only property acquired by theft, which is in the hands of the wealthy; they not only do not protect the workman, who has not property, but they directly contribute to the exploitation of that labor."

In the process of evolution ballots have become a commodity and capitalists of the Mark Hanna breed buy them as if they were peanuts. Socialism is engaged in restoring the ballot to its pristine dignity and mission, and says to those who have a right to wield it:

"Take the ballot in your own free right hand. Grasp the ballot in the fist of your own free right hand. Go to the polls defiantly holding aloft the ballot in your own free right hand. Put the ballot in the ballot-box with your own free right hand. And if a capitalist or his henchman proposes to buy your ballot knock him into the middle of next week with the fist of your own free right hand."

That is one of the patriotic uses to which a man may devote his own free right hand.

If you held the title to ten thousand acres of good land, couldn't you get rich—without work?

If you could borrow money from the government at 1 per cent and loan it to the farmers in your county at 10 per cent, couldn't you get rich without work?

If you happened to be born rich, had plenty of money, lived in a country where men were made cheap and money was made dear, couldn't you get richer—without work?

If you had obtained a monopoly on some natural product, like coal or oil or lumber or silver or gold—things that you could not make—and millions of people wanted them, couldn't you get rich—without work?

If you have brains and can think for yourself, hadn't you better think?

### The Church

Socialism does not inveigh against the church per se. Indeed, the term "church" is of such complex significance that lexicographers bemoan rather than elucidate the subject. The term may mean a building or an organization or a system of theology, as, for instance, the Roman church, the Greek church, the English church or the Protestant church. But the Protestant church is split up into so many fragments, each styled a church, that discussion breeds confusion which becomes worse confounded as we proceed. Occasionally some Shakespearean star tries to play the great tragedy of Hamlet by omitting Hamlet, and thereby reduces the drama to a farce. The churches professedly have Christ for their central idea. How often they make the mistake of the Shakespearean tragedians referred to need not be mentioned.

The church is in the world, but affirms it is not of the world—that is, of this world. Socialism is in this world, is of this world. It knows nothing about any other world. Its teachings are not occult, mysterious, unfathomable. In this is seen the wide difference between Socialism and the church. Socialism deals with men's bodies, the church with men's souls. In the wilderness there were "five thousand men, besides women and children." They were hungry. Christ took in the situation at a glance. He asked no questions. He just fed the vast multitude, so we are told. Socialism has no power to work miracles, but it seeks to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, shelter the homeless and make this world brighter and better for man's habitation. And this it does upon principles eminently scientific without the aid of any other force except a ceaseless appeal to reason.

Socialism appreciates the fact that the church is in the grasp of environments which it cannot overcome. It manages to secure vast revenues. It builds edifices as grand as Diana's temple and fills them with paintings and sculpture, while outside, under their shadow, the poor perish for the necessities of life, the excuse being that the architectural wonders are erected to "honor God," when the Bible affirms that the "Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands."

Socialism, if it could command the funds, would build co-operative factories and other industrial establishments, and homes for the toilers, bright and beautiful, dotting the country with landscapes as delectable as a poet's dream.

It is possible that the church is doing as well as it knows how, however lamentably little that may be, in the advocacy of better conditions for workers and a better civilization for the world. At any

rate, if Socialism discovers that the church is breaking away from its former and expanding in the direction of time, it will heartily enter its commendation. If the church should ever descend into such a position as in South Africa and the Philippine islands, Socialism will be quick to admit the reformer; or if the church should ever be moved to arraign capitalism for its ten thousand iniquities and resolve to devote its powers in the interests of working men and women, Socialism will hail the advent of such a departure from the old beaten pathway in which it has traveled for centuries with acclamations of approval.

### The Strike

For workingmen to strike is to declare industrial war. Nevertheless, the strike is as much to be credited to evolution as the coming of labor-saving machinery or the trust.

There is profound philosophy in a labor strike, the primary cause of which is injustice to workingmen. Workingmen never strike without a grievance and never except to correct a wrong more or less flagrant.

We hear much nowadays about industrial evolution. It is credited with producing capitalism, the trust, labor-saving machinery, etc. Admit it. The strike is also to be credited to industrial evolution. It could not occur but for labor organization, and trade unions confessedly are to be credited to industrial evolution.

Here, then, we have an epitomized view of the industrial strike—at the bottom injustice, then the grievance, then the organization and finally the strike. Cause and effect, wrong and resistance.

At this juncture we moralize. We say strikes are expensive and often entail vastly more suffering than they realize. It was said by Admiral Porter that "a pin was worth fighting for if it involved a principle." The dictum is valuable because it explains the why and the wherefore of the industrial strike. But there are other considerations involved in an industrial strike. It would be a gloomy day for labor if capitalism had succeeded in so debauching workingmen that they would accept degradation without protest or resistance. Fortunately that day has not come, though capitalism is concentrating all its forces to expedite its advent.

There is not a student of present industrial conditions worthy of the name who does not know that in the very nature of things they breed strikes and that they will occur in spite of injunctions and all the death-dealing machinery at the command of the government, while workingmen retain enough manhood and self-respect and courage to resist enslavement.

True, and unfortunately true, it may be said that labor strikes are purely individual in their scope; that is to say, they are for the benefit of those who engage in them. A labor organization may have a grievance and strike to remedy the wrong of which it complains. In the struggle other organizations are not involved. Labor, in any broad sense, takes no hand in the fight. If the individual organization wins a victory, well and good. If defeat results, it must take the consequences and bear resulting misfortune with such composure as it can command.

The real significance of the industrial strike is that workingmen are resisting oppression and at the same time studying conditions. In this their attention is directed to remedies proposed by Socialism. The strike at best settles nothing permanently. It must be forever renewed, bequeathed from bleeding sire to son, until capitalism in some great battle overwhelms labor in irretrievable defeat.

Socialism takes in the whole body of labor and points out that by co-operation workingmen may solve the labor problem; that once unified, all pulling together, they will prove more potent than capitalism; that by co-operation they will regain possession of their tools, they will own labor-saving machinery and compel it to exalt rather than debase labor; that the iron arms of the steam engine will work to lift the burdens from the back of labor; that the hammers will beat, the forges blaze, the wheels revolve, the spindles whirl and the shuttles fly by the irrevocable decree of co-operative labor. The strike is helping on the good work. The better day is already dawning. The signs of the times are auspicious, and the ballot will yet prove a potent factor in ushering in the co-operative commonwealth.

The American cigar factory at Passaic, N. J., started up April 29, after a lapse of one week, caused by the strike of employes. The first break in the strike occurred when fifteen of the girl cigarmakers returned to work with twenty brought from New York. The firm is paying only 25 cents per hundred, which is 10 cents less than the girls demanded and 2 cents less than the rate before the strike. At 6 o'clock the police charged the strikers, who gathered at the mill. The girls resented the rough treatment. Several girls were dragged along the streets by the hair and the strikers have gained sympathy by the police brutality.

Any reader of The Herald who would like to do something for Socialism and who has not time to write, should send his name and address to the editor.

## SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDENT RIOTS IN RUSSIA

Are the student riots in Russia accidental, or are they, as the American press would have us believe, symptomatic of a deep-seated disease in the empire of the czar? The continental European journals generally do not regard the demonstrations in Moscow, St. Petersburg and other Russian cities as at all serious, and believe that they indicate merely the necessity for reforms in the method of governing universities in Russia. French papers blame the English press for exaggerating the disturbances. The Temps (Paris), which supports the alliance with Russia, manages to treat the subject so skillfully that, in a two-column article, it does not express even the shade of an opinion. The Journal des Debats (Paris) declares that the question is solely one of reorganizing the interior administration of the universities, and that it has no political significance whatever. It is a struggle for academic liberty, says this journal, such as is found in German universities, for the liberty of doctrine and association which is enjoyed by professors and students in universities the world over—except in Russia. There is a good deal of the idealist about the Russian student, says the Frankfurter Zeitung, and the government, in trying to treat him like a child, has done its best to foster a desire for martyrdom in him. It continues:

"The truth is that in Russia the government has never realized that in the hands of the youth of the country lies the future of Russia, and this is particularly so of the youth of the universities. The statesmen of the present seem to have adopted the policy of the first Nicholas and to wish to treat them like soldiers. Any symptoms of discontent with the attitude of the government, or what the bureaucrats take to be discontent, are punished by forcible enrollment in the army. It may be remarked that the Russian soldiers are far better treated than they were fifty years ago, and that, therefore, the punishment of compulsory service is not so severe as it was when Nicholas I. was emperor. But the principle is the same—the government thinks that intellectual movements can be stamped out by military discipline."

The Independence Belge (Brussels) publishes a dispatch from St. Petersburg stating that General Dragomirov, commander in the Kieff district, has protested to the czar against the army's being used as "a house of correction for fractious students." Military service, he is reported to have said, should never be made a penalty for insubordination. The Independence Belge also publishes a statement signed by forty-five Russian authors and educators, recounting the facts connected with the riots and the violence of the Cossacks, and claiming that the protest, which has been sent to "every newspaper in Europe," has the endorsement of "all intellectual Russia."

A writer in the Nation (Berlin) reviews the history of Russian legislation affecting the universities for the past half-century, and declares that considerable progress in toleration has been made; but thinks that the government might easily have granted the demands of the students in the present instance without at all compromising its authority. M. Plekhanoff, a leading Russian revolutionist, has declared (in an interview published in the Secolo di Milan) that the student movement has the hearty support of the masses of the empire. In support of this statement he points out that the workmen of Moscow and St. Petersburg made common cause with the rioting students, and also that in the crowd which assaulted the Kasan cathedral in the latter city there were found merchants and persons of nearly every profession. The riots, he concludes, are the result of a well-prepared and well-managed propaganda which the revolutionists are carrying into every corner of Russia.

From reliable sources in Vienna (nothing on the subject is permitted by the censor to appear in the Russian papers) the correspondent of the Times (London) declares these riots to be the "first serious symptom of a far-reaching revolutionary agitation of which more will probably be heard hereafter." Commenting upon this report, the St. James' Gazette (London) remarks: "However improper it may be for foreigners to wish well to violent revolution in a friendly country, it would be impossible for Englishmen to withhold sympathy if there were the smallest prospect of 'revolutionary agitation' leading to any practical result in Russia."

There are two "Hope Halls" in the United States, where penniless, homeless and friendless discharged and pardoned prisoners are taken in and cared for until they can find work. It is a Salvation Army idea and a good one. But if present conditions continue and the population of prisons increases there will be a necessity for "Hope Halls" on every hill and plane in the country.

A Socialist writer remarks, "Of course I don't suppose for a moment that there is any danger that the social millennium will arrive so quickly as to overturn existing conditions as a cyclone capsize a house." But that sort of a thing does happen sometimes, as, for instance, in France, when the revolution, which Victor Hugo calls a "superb catastrophe" not only capsize a house, but a throne, including the basile. History can repeat itself.







